Marrying *ab initio* calculations and Halo EFT: the case of $^7\mathrm{Be} + p \to {}^8\mathrm{B} + \gamma$

Xilin Zhang,[1] Kenneth M. Nollett,[1] and D. R. Phillips[1]

[1] *Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics and Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701, USA*

(Dated: December 2013)

We report a leading-order (LO) calculation of $^7\mathrm{Be}(p,\gamma)^8\mathrm{B}$ in a low-energy effective field theory. ^{8}B is treated as a shallow proton+^{7}Be core and proton+^{7}Be* (core excitation) p-wave bound state. The couplings are fixed using measured binding energies and proton-^{7}Be s-wave scattering lengths, together with ^{8}B asymptotic normalization coefficients from *ab initio* calculations. We obtain a zero-energy S-factor of 18.2 ± 1.2 (ANC only) eV b. Given that this is a LO result it is consistent with the recommended value $S(0) = 20.8 \pm 1.6$ eV b. Our computed $S(E)$ compares favorably with experimental data on $^7\mathrm{Be}(p,\gamma)^8\mathrm{B}$ for $E < 0.4$ MeV. We emphasize the important role of proton-^{7}Be scattering parameters in determining the energy dependence of $S(E)$, and demonstrate that their present uncertainties significantly limit attempts to extrapolate these data to stellar energies.

PACS numbers: 25.20.-x, 25.40.Lw, 11.10.Ef, 21.10.Jx, 21.60.De

arXiv:1401.4482v1 [nucl-th] 17 Jan 2014

Introduction.— The cross section of the reaction $^7\mathrm{Be}(p,\gamma)^8\mathrm{B}$ is important for constraining properties of neutrino oscillations and solar composition through solar-neutrino experiments (e.g., [1, 2]). It must be known at very low (~ 20 keV) energies, and this presents a general problem common to nearly all processes in stellar nuclear burning [3]. Such cross sections are very small at these energies because of Coulomb barriers. Most direct measurements have to be carried out at higher energies with larger cross sections and extrapolated down to stellar energies using models.

The accuracy of this approach often suffers from a scarcity of ancillary constraints like elastic cross sections. It also depends on model assumptions regarding, e.g., the number of R-matrix poles or the shape of a potential well. Often the relevance of the constraints to their desired application is doubtful but hard to quantify (as reviewed for $^7\mathrm{Be}(p,\gamma)^8\mathrm{B}$ in Ref. [1]). Recent advances in *ab initio* calculations hold promise to ameliorate the situation [4], but accurate and complete three-nucleon forces are yet to be fully incorporated there [5].

The degrees of freedom and general philosophy of effective field theory (EFT) treatments of such reactions are the same as those in R-matrix and potential-model calculations. EFTs also fix their couplings from particular observables and then predict others. But the EFT's systematic expansion provides a quantitative estimate of the uncertainty at each order of approximation and a framework to improve accuracy. The particular EFT we use here, Halo EFT [6–14], does this by exploiting the separation of energy scales associated with the presence of clusters. Much of a nucleon-level reaction calculation amounts to an indirect treatment of the collective motion of clusters through and around Coulomb and centrifugal barriers, so Halo EFT can profitably be combined with *ab initio* calculations. We extract asymptotic normalization coefficients (ANCs) from *ab initio* eight-body calculations [4, 15], combine them with p-^{7}Be scattering lengths from both experiment [16] and theory [4], and perform a predictive Halo EFT computation of $^7\mathrm{Be}(p,\gamma)^8\mathrm{B}$. This extends Ref. [17]'s calculation of E1 proton capture to the case of a p-wave bound state.

Momentum scale	Definition	Value
$k_C \sim \gamma$	$Q_c Q_n \alpha_{EM} M_\mathrm{R}$	24.02 MeV
γ	$\sqrt{2M_R B_{^8\mathrm{B}}}$	15.04 MeV
Λ	$\sqrt{2M'_R B_{^7\mathrm{Be}}}$	70 MeV
$\gamma^* \sim \gamma$	$\sqrt{2M_R(B_{^8\mathrm{B}} + E^*)}$	30.53 MeV
$\gamma_\Delta \sim \gamma$	$\sqrt{2M_R E^*}$	26.57 MeV
$a_{^3S_1}$, $a_{^5S_2} \sim 1/\gamma$	scattering lengths	Varies
$r_0 \sim 1/\Lambda$	$l = 0$ effective ranges	Varies
$a_1 \sim \gamma^{-2}\Lambda^{-1}$	scattering volume	1054.1 fm^3
$r_1 \sim \Lambda$	$l = 1$ effective "range"	-0.34 fm^{-1}

TABLE I: Key physical scales in our EFT. The $^8\mathrm{B} \to p + {}^7\mathrm{Be}$ threshold is $B_{^8\mathrm{B}}$, the $^7\mathrm{Be} \to {}^3\mathrm{He} + {}^4\mathrm{He}$ threshold is $B_{^7\mathrm{Be}}$, and the ^{7}Be core-excitation energy is E^*. The p-^{7}Be effective mass $M_\mathrm{R} \equiv M_\mathrm{n} M_\mathrm{c}/(M_\mathrm{n} + M_\mathrm{c}) = 7/8 M_\mathrm{n}$ and the ^{3}He-^{4}He effective mass $M'_R = 12/7 M_\mathrm{n}$. The scattering parameters a and r in the incoming s-wave channels are not well determined, but generically obey the hierarchy given here. The numbers for a_1 and r_1 are extracted from *ab initio* ANCs.

Energy scales and Lagrangian.— It is essential to identify all the pertinent energy scales in this problem (Table I). The presence of a Coulomb barrier generates a low-momentum scale, k_C, associated with its height [14, 17, 18]. k_C is comparable to the binding momentum of ^{8}B, γ, which is our generic low-energy scale. The large p-^{7}Be scattering lengths yield two more, quite similar, low-energy scales. All of these generate non-analytic dependence in the S-factor $S(E)$: if $k = \sqrt{2M_\mathrm{R}E}$ then $S = S(k_C/k, ka, k/\gamma)$. We keep the full dependence on these ratios generated by Halo EFT at LO and so have nontrivial analytic structure due to long-wavelength properties of Coulomb wave functions and strong initial-state interactions. This stands in con-

trast to the Taylor [19–22] expansion sometimes used to describe $S(E)$ around $E = 0$. The EFT's high-energy scale is Λ, the momentum at which ^{7}Be sub-structure is resolved. $\Lambda \approx 70$ MeV is set by the threshold for $^7\mathrm{Be} \to {}^3\mathrm{He} + {}^4\mathrm{He}$ and is the radius of convergence in the momentum plane of our result for $S(k)$, which is accurate up to corrections suppressed by γ/Λ. The ^{8}B ground state is bound by 0.1375 MeV, so $\gamma/\Lambda \approx 0.2$. We use the power counting of Ref. [10] to describe this shallow p-wave bound state: $a_1^{-1} \sim \Lambda\gamma^2$, $r_1 \sim \Lambda$. We also include the core excitation ^{7}Be* as an explicit degree of freedom. Its excitation energy E^* is another low-energy scale.

The Lagrangian we use is $\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_S + \mathcal{L}_P$ (cf. Ref. [23]):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_0 &= n^{\dagger\sigma}\left(i\partial_t + \frac{\nabla^2}{2M_\mathrm{n}}\right) n_\sigma + c^{\dagger a}\left(i\partial_t + \frac{\nabla^2}{2M_\mathrm{c}}\right) c_a \\
&\quad + d^{\dagger\delta}\left(i\partial_t + \frac{\nabla^2}{2M_\mathrm{c}}\right) d_\delta + \pi^{\dagger\alpha}\left(i\partial_t + \frac{\nabla^2}{2M_\mathrm{nc}} + \Delta\right)\pi_\alpha \ , \\
\mathcal{L}_S &= g_{(^3S_1)} c^{\dagger a'} n^{\dagger\sigma'} T^i_{a'\sigma'} T^{a\sigma}_i c_a n_\sigma \\
&\quad + g_{(^5S_2)} c^{\dagger a'} n^{\dagger\sigma'} T^\alpha_{a'\sigma'} T^{a\sigma}_\alpha c_a n_\sigma \\
&\quad + g_{(^3S_1^*)} d^{\dagger\delta} n^{\dagger\sigma'} T^i_{\delta\sigma'} T^{a\sigma}_i c_a n_\sigma + \mathrm{C.C.} \ , \qquad (1) \\
\mathcal{L}_P &= h_{(^3P_2)} \pi^{\dagger\alpha} T^{ij}_\alpha T^{\sigma a}_i n_\sigma i \left(\boldsymbol{V}_n - \boldsymbol{V}_c\right)_j c_a \\
&\quad + h_{(^5P_2)} \pi^{\dagger\alpha} T^{\beta j}_\alpha T^{\sigma a}_\beta n_\sigma i \left(\boldsymbol{V}_n - \boldsymbol{V}_c\right)_j c_a \\
&\quad + h_{(^3P_2^*)} \pi^{\dagger\alpha} T^{jk}_\alpha T^{\delta\sigma}_k n_\sigma i (\boldsymbol{V}_n - \boldsymbol{V}_{c^*})_j d_\delta + \mathrm{C.C.} \ . \qquad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

Here n_σ, c_a, d_δ, π_α are fields of the proton ("nucleon"), ^{7}Be core ($\frac{3}{2}^-$), ^{7}Be* ($\frac{1}{2}^-$), and ^{8}B ground state (2^+) respectively; $g_{(^3S_1)}$ and $g_{(^5S_2)}$ in $\mathcal{L}_S$ are related to "unnaturally" enhanced $\sim 1/\gamma$ s-wave charged-particle scattering lengths (see Refs. [14, 17, 18]); $g_{(^3S_1^*)}$ describes $^7\mathrm{Be} + p \leftrightarrow {}^7\mathrm{Be}^* + p$ and is assumed to be natural, i.e. $\sim 1/\Lambda$ [23]; and h_Y are the p-wave couplings. The fields' indices are their spin projections with a specific convention: $\sigma, \delta, \sigma', \delta' = \pm 1/2$, $a, a' = \pm 3/2, \pm 1/2$, $\alpha, \beta = \pm 2, \pm 1, 0$, and $i, j, k = \pm 1, 0$; Δ is π^α's bare binding energy; $T^{\cdots}_{\cdots}$s are the C-G coefficients (cf. [23]); $\boldsymbol{V}_{n;c}$ are proton and core velocities. To implement electromagnetic interactions, we use minimal substitution $\partial_\mu \to \partial_\mu + ieQA_\mu$ with $e \equiv \sqrt{4\pi\alpha_{EM}}$ and Q the particle's charge.

p-wave scattering and shallow bound state.— We denote π^α's dressed propagator as $D^\beta_\alpha \equiv D\delta^\beta_\alpha$. Its self energy receives contributions from p-^{7}Be intermediate states in the $^3P_2$ and $^5P_2$ channels, and p-^{7}Be* in the $^3P_2$ channel [23]. In each case the proton and ^{7}Be (^{7}Be*) interact via the Coulomb interaction. We include these Coulomb effects to all orders in α_{EM}, thereby extending the calculation of Refs. [14, 17, 18] to p-waves. In practice this involves replacing the plane waves of Ref. [23] by Coulomb wave functions in both external legs and intermediate states. $D(E)$ can then be written in terms of the a_1 and r_1 in the 2^+ channel:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{-6\pi M_\mathrm{R}}{h_t^2\, D} &= -\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{r_1}{2}k^2 - 2k_C(k^2 + k_C^2)H(k_C/k) \\
&\quad - 2k_C \frac{h^2_{(^3P_2^*)}}{h_t^2}(k_*^2 + k_C^2)H(k_C/k_*) \ . \qquad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

with $H(\eta) = \psi(i\eta) + 1/(2i\eta) - \ln(i\eta)$ [24], $h_t^2 \equiv h^2_{(^3P_2)} + h^2_{(^5P_2)}$ and $k_* \equiv \sqrt{2M_\mathrm{R}(E - E^*)}$. a_1 and r_1 are then functions of the Lagrangian parameters Δ, $h_{(^3P_2)}$, $h_{(^5P_2)}$, and $h_{(^3P_2^*)}$. If $k < \gamma_\Delta$ we recover the standard Coulomb-modified effective-range expansion for $l = 1$, i.e. the right-hand side of Eq. (3) becomes $C^2_{\eta,1}k^3(\cot\delta_1 - i)$, with δ_1 the phase shift relative to a Coulomb wave, $C_{\eta,l} \equiv 2^l \exp(-\pi\eta/2)|\Gamma(l+1+i\eta)|/\Gamma(2l+2)$, and $\eta \equiv k_C/k$ [25, 26].

We write the p-wave Coulomb-distorted T-matrix, T_{CS} [14, 26], in the p-^{7}Be-^{7}Be* Hilbert space schematically as $V \times D(E) \times V$. (V stands for n-$c(d)$-π interactions and D is given by Eq. (3).) Since T_{CS} has a pole at $B_{^8\mathrm{B}}$ we have $D^{-1}(k = i\gamma) = 0$. The residue then yields a relation for the wave-function renormalization factor, Z:

$$\frac{6\pi}{Z} + h_t^2\, r_1 = 2\frac{k_C}{\gamma}\left\{\frac{h_t^2}{\gamma^2}\left[2\gamma^3\tilde{H}\left(\frac{k_C}{\gamma}\right) + (k_C^3 - k_C\gamma^2)\tilde{H}'\left(\frac{k_C}{\gamma}\right)\right] + \frac{h^2_{(^3P_2^*)}}{\gamma^{*2}}\left[2\gamma^{*3}\tilde{H}\left(\frac{k_C}{\gamma^*}\right) + (k_C^3 - k_C\gamma^{*2})\tilde{H}'\left(\frac{k_C}{\gamma_*}\right)\right]\right\}, \qquad (4)$$

where, for convenience, we define $\tilde{H}(z) \equiv H(-iz)$, $\tilde{H}'(z) \equiv d\tilde{H}(z)/dz$. The $^8\mathrm{B} \to p + {}^7\mathrm{Be}(^7\mathrm{Be}^*)$ ANCs, $C_{(^5P_2)}$, $C_{(^3P_2)}$, and $C_{(^3P_2^*)}$ are then given by (cf. Ref. [23]):

$$\frac{C^2_{(Y)}}{h_Y^2\gamma^2\Gamma^2(2 + k_C/\gamma)} = \frac{C^2_{(^3P_2^*)}}{h^2_{(^3P_2^*)}\gamma^{*2}\Gamma^2(2 + k_C/\gamma^*)} = \frac{Z}{3\pi}, \qquad (5)$$

with $Y = {}^3P_2$ and $^5P_2$.

Leading-order proton capture.— The relevant diagrams are shown in Fig. 1. Let us first focus on initial total spin $S_i = 1$ and use the notation, $\langle\pi^\alpha|L_{EM}|\chi^{(+)}_{\boldsymbol{p}}, \delta, a\rangle \equiv T_i^{\delta a}T_\alpha^{ij}\mathcal{M}_j$. The LO $\mathcal{M}_j$ is computed in coordinate space, and decomposed into contributions from incoming s- and d-waves.

$$\mathcal{M}_j = (-i)C_{\eta,0}C^{\rm LO}_{(^3P_2)}\frac{Z_{eff}}{M_{\rm R}}\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}\left(\gamma^2+k^2\right)\left[e^{i\sigma_0}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_j Y_{00}(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}})\mathcal{S}(^3S_1)+e^{i\sigma_2}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_k\sqrt{2}T^{ka}_j Y_{2a}(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}})\mathcal{D}\right] ,$$

$$\mathcal{S}(X)\equiv\int_0^{+\infty}drW_{-\eta_B,\frac{3}{2}}(2\gamma r)r\left[\frac{C_{\eta,0}G_0(k,r)}{-a^{-1}_{(X)}-2k_C H(\eta)}+\frac{F_0(k,r)}{C_{\eta,0}k}\frac{-a^{-1}_{(X)}-2k_C{\rm Re}\left[H(\eta)\right]}{-a^{-1}_{(X)}-2k_C H(\eta)}\right],$$

$$\mathcal{D}\equiv\int_0^{+\infty}drW_{-\eta_B,\frac{3}{2}}(2\gamma r)r\frac{F_2(k,r)}{C_{\eta,0}k} . \qquad (6)$$

Here $C^{\rm LO}_{(^3P_2)}$ is the LO ANC (see below); $Z_{eff}/M_{\rm R}\equiv eQ_n/M_{\rm n}-eQ_c/M_{\rm c}$; $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*$ is the photon polarization vector; σ_l is the Coulomb phase shift; F_l and G_l are Coulomb wave functions for angular momentum l, and $W_{-\eta_B,\frac{3}{2}}$ is a Whittaker function with $\eta_B\equiv k_C/\gamma$ [25]. Proceeding similarly with $S_i=2$ we obtain the same result but with $(C^{\rm LO}_{(^3P_2)},\, a_{(^3S_1)})\to(C^{\rm LO}_{(^5P_2)},\, a_{(^5S_2)})$. The s-wave scattering lengths, $a_{(^3S_1)}$ and $a_{(^5S_2)}$, describe LO incoming channel multiple scattering (ICMS) effects. We thus obtain the S-factor including all initial channels:

$$S(E) \;=\; \frac{e^{2\pi\eta}}{e^{2\pi\eta}-1}\frac{Z^2_{eff}}{M^2_{\rm R}}\frac{\pi}{24}\omega k_C\left(\gamma^2+k^2\right)^2\;\frac{5}{3}\left[{C^{\rm LO}_{(^3P_2)}}^2\left(\mid\mathcal{S}(^3S_1)\mid^2+2\mid\mathcal{D}\mid^2\right)+{C^{\rm LO}_{(^5P_2)}}^2\left(\mid\mathcal{S}(^5S_2)\mid^2+2\mid\mathcal{D}\mid^2\right)\right] , \qquad (7)$$

	$C_{(^3P_2)}$	$C_{(^5P_2)}$	$a_{(^3S_1)}$	$a_{(^5S_2)}$
Nollett	−0.315(19)	−0.662(19)		
Navratil	−0.294	−0.650	−5.2	−15.3
Tabacaru	0.294(45)	0.615(45)		
Angulo			25(9)	−7(3)

TABLE II: Input parameters. "Nollett" [15] and "Navratil" [4] are *ab initio* results, while "Tabacaru" [29] and "Angulo" [16] are from experiment. The units are $\mathrm{fm}^{-1/2}$ and fm for ANCs and scattering lengths respectively.

	$S(0)$ (eV b)	$S_{(^3S_1)}(0)$	$d_1(\mathrm{MeV}^{-1})$	d_2 (MeV^{-2})
No+A	18.2 ± 1.2	3.1 ± 0.4	−1.62	10.3
Na	17.8	3.0	−1.26	10.8
T+A	15.7 ± 2.7	2.7 ± 0.8	−1.62	10.3
Ref. [1]	20.8 ± 1.6		-1.5 ± 0.1	6.5 ± 2.0

TABLE III: Results for Taylor-expansion coefficients. No+A, Na, and T+A, are the results from using "Nollett"+"Angulo", "Navratil", and "Tabacaru"+"Angulo" inputs listed in Table II. The uncertainties in No+A and T+A entries are due to ANC uncertainties listed in Table II. Recommended values from Ref. [1] are shown for comparison.



FIG. 1: Diagrams for capture. The line assignments are designated by the spin indices; the shaded blobs denote the full Coulomb Green functions; the bold vertex in the last two diagrams means S-wave multiple scattering with the Coulomb interaction included to all orders in α_{EM} [18, 23]. Diagrams with the photon coupled to the proton are not shown, but are included in our calculation.

Results.— Table II collects information on $^8\mathrm{B}\to{}^7\mathrm{Be}+p$ ANCs and p-^{7}Be scattering lengths. The *ab initio* ANCs of Nollett & Wiringa were computed using variational Monte Carlo with the Argonne $v18$ + Urbana IX Hamiltonian [27, 28], which includes three-nucleon terms. They are consistent with those from experiment [29] and may have smaller errors (though errors reported for the calculation account only for Monte Carlo sampling). These ANCs are also consistent with *ab initio* ANCs found from an SRG-N^{2}LO two-body interaction in the RGM-NCSM approach by Navratil *et al.* [4]. We extended the calculations in Ref. [15] to include the $^8\mathrm{B}\to{}^7\mathrm{Be}^*+p$ ANC, $C_{(^3P^*_2)}=-0.3485(51)\ \mathrm{fm}^{-1/2}$.

Using the Nollett ANCs, the ^{8}B binding energy, and Eqs. (5) and (4) we obtain the results for a_1 and r_1 shown in Table I – values that conform to the scaling assigned to a_1 and r_1. Given this input information, we work strictly to LO, so the right-hand side of Eq. (4) is set to zero, yielding $Z^{\rm LO}=-6\pi/h_t^2 r_1$. We then define corresponding "LO ANCs" $C^{\rm LO}_{(\cdots)}$ via Eq. (5), which differ from the full ANCs by ${C^{\rm LO}_{(\cdots)}}^2/C^2_{(\cdots)}=Z^{\rm LO}/Z=0.87$. From these and Eq. (7) we compute the LO E1 S-factor for $^7\mathrm{Be}(p,\gamma)^8\mathrm{B}$. At low energies, $E<0.1$ MeV, a quadratic approximation $S(E)=S(0)(1+d_1E+d_2E^2)$ is customary [20–22]. Table III lists results, based on different inputs, for the full $S(0)$, the S_i=1 channel contribution $S_{(^3S_1)}(0)$, d_1, and d_2. The peripheral nature of the capture in this regime means both the $S_i=1$ and $S_i=2$ contributions to $S(0)$ depend only very weakly on ICMS—as seen in Refs. [20–22]. As a result, $S_{(^3S_1)}(0)$ and $S_{(^5S_2)}(0)$ essentially both scale with their corresponding LO ANCs.



FIG. 2: $E1$ S-factor for proton capture on ^{7}Be. The green band is the range of $S(E)$ in the LO calculation with "No + A" input (cf. Table III), varying scattering lengths within their 1σ errors. The (nearly energy-independent) impact of the ANC error bar on the prediction is indicated by the error bar on the "No + A" band at 20 keV. The data are from Refs. [31–34]. The dashed line is the LO result with "Na" input. The solid line shows the corresponding full RGM-NCSM result [4] for comparison.

The recommended value of Ref. [1] for $S(0)$, which was fitted to direct capture data, is consistent with our $S(0)$ within uncertainties (including the higher-order EFT uncertainty of $\approx 10\%$, see below). The d_1 and d_2 of Ref. [1] were obtained by fitting quadratics to model curves (not data) in the range $0 \le E \le 50$ keV; we define our coefficients in the same way and find consistent results, though our d_2 are near the high end of a large variation among models. Exact derivatives computed at threshold are in close agreement with potential models [30].

In Fig. 2 we show the LO Halo EFT prediction for $S(E)$ obtained from the "Nollett" ANCs and the 1σ range of experimental scattering lengths [16]. The errors on the ANCs smear out the prediction by an additional $\sim 10\%$ at all energies as shown by an error bar at 20 keV. In contrast, the impact of scattering length uncertainties increases dramatically with energy: when $E < 0.1$ MeV, it is $< 5\%$, but it reaches 20% at $E \approx 0.4$ MeV. The consequent range of Halo-EFT predictions is consistent with direct capture data for $0.1 \le E \le 0.4$ MeV (below the $M1$ resonance) and with indirect S-factors derived from Coulomb breakup [35–37]. However, the energy dependence seen at the upper edge of the band in Fig. 2 is not consistent with the trend of the data. This rapidly rising $S(E)$ happens because the real part of the denominator in Eq. (6) vanishes at some energy $E_p > 0$ if $a_{(^5S_2)} < 0$. E_p is quite low with $a_{(^5S_2)} = -15.3$ fm from RGM-NCSM [4], so the dashed Halo-EFT curve that we obtain with the RGM-NCSM inputs rises significantly faster than the data. We emphasize that this increase is *not* the well-known $M1$ resonance contribution [1, 4], since the resonant channel is not included in our calculation. We show $S(E)$ up to $E = 0.5$ MeV, where the resonance has little impact and ICMS effects can generate marked energy dependence in $S(E)$.

The energy dependence of the full RGM-NCSM calculation (solid curve) is much gentler than the Halo EFT result using its $a_{(^5S_2)}$, and the difference must reflect higher-order terms in the EFT capture amplitude. We assess the impact of next-to-leading-order (NLO) contributions in two ways. First, we introduce an effective-range term in the s-wave scattering amplitude. For simplicity we choose the same effective range, r_0, for both channels. Varying r_0 from its LO value of 0 fm to 2 fm changes the S-factor by less than 10%, even when $a_{(^5S_2)} = -15.3$ fm and $E = 0.4$ MeV so that the effect is largest. Second, we change the lower limit of integration, $r_{\rm min}$, in Eq. (6) to estimate the size of higher-order, short-distance effects like the contact operators that enter the capture amplitudes at NLO [23]. With "Na" input and $r_0 = 2$ fm, an $r_{\rm min}$ of 2 fm flattens $S(E)$, reducing it by 10% at 0.4 MeV. Varying parameters by hand, we find that $r_0 = r_{\rm min} = 3$ fm brings the energy dependence of our LO "Na" $S(E)$ curve close to that of the full RGM-NCSM result.

We emphasize that although the precise magnitude and shape of $S(E)$ predicted by Halo EFT will be modified by higher-order contributions, the sensitivity to p-^{7}Be scattering parameters we have diagnosed here should persist. We conclude that it is important to improve the accuracy of s-wave scattering length (and perhaps effective range) measurements in order to constrain the extrapolation of $S(E)$ data to zero energy. This supports similar conclusions from other formalisms [1, 35, 38]. Models with incorrect scattering lengths get a key non-analyticity of the low-energy capture amplitude wrong.

Summary.— We have applied Halo EFT to radiative proton capture on ^{7}Be. In Halo EFT the short-distance piece of the Coulomb-nuclear interference is entangled with the pure nuclear amplitude, so this process is not straightforwardly connected to radiative neutron capture on ^{7}Li, although isospin symmetry is regularly used to relate the two in models. Discussion of this issue and other details of our calculation will be presented elsewhere [39]. The strategy used here is however the same as in Ref. [23]: fix the EFT couplings using *ab initio* ANCs and experimental binding energies and scattering lengths.

Our LO Halo EFT result for $S(0)$ is $\approx 10\%$ below the recommended value [1], but is consistent with it within the combined EFT and ANC uncertainties. The significant uncertainties in the experimental $a_{(^5S_2)}$ and $a_{(^3S_1)}$ mean that the energy dependence of $S(E)$ is not well constrained above 0.1 MeV, although the central values produce a trend that agrees with direct capture data quite well. This shows the importance of improved measurements of p-^{7}Be scattering, which would render the extrapolation of capture data to solar energies more reliable. On the theory side a next-to-leading-order calcu-

lation of $p + {}^7\mathrm{Be} \to {}^8\mathrm{B} + \gamma$ will be important to reduce the EFT uncertainty and so make Halo EFT competitive as a tool for determining this key input to predictions of solar neutrino fluxes.

Acknowledgments.— X.Z. and D.R.P. acknowledge support from the US Department of Energy under grant DE-FG02-93ER-40756. K.M.N. acknowledges support from the Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics at Ohio University. We thank Carl Brune for useful comments on the manuscript.

[1] E. G. Adelberger, A. B. Balantekin, D. Bemmerer, C. A. Bertulani, J. -W. Chen, H. Costantini, M. Couder and R. Cyburt *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 195 (2011) [arXiv:1004.2318 [nucl-ex]].
[2] W. C. Haxton, R. G. H. Robertson, and A. M. Serenelli, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **51**, 21 (2013).
[3] C. E. Rolfs and W. S. Rodney, *Cauldrons in the cosmos: Nuclear astrophysics* (1988).
[4] P. Navratil, R. Roth and S. Quaglioni, Phys. Lett. B **704**, 379 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5977 [nucl-th]].
[5] G. Hupin, J. Langhammer, P. Navrtil, S. Quaglioni, A. Calci and R. Roth, arXiv:1308.2700 [nucl-th].
[6] U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. A **645** (1999) 273.
[7] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **424** (1998) 390.
[8] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **534** (1998) 329.
[9] C. A. Bertulani, H.-W. Hammer and U. Van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. A **712** (2002) 37.
[10] P. F. Bedaque, H.-W. Hammer and U. van Kolck, Phys. Lett. B **569** (2003) 159.
[11] H. -W. Hammer and D. R. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. A **865**, 17 (2011).
[12] G. Rupak and R. Higa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 222501 (2011).
[13] D. L. Canham and H. -W. Hammer, Eur. Phys. J. A **37**, 367 (2008).
[14] R. Higa, H. -W. Hammer and U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. A **809**, 171 (2008).
[15] K. M. Nollett and R. B. Wiringa, Phys. Rev. C **83**, 041001 (2011) [arXiv:1102.1787 [nucl-th]].
[16] C. Angulo *et. al.,* Nucl. Phys. A **716**, 211 (2003).
[17] E. Ryberg, C. Forssén, H.-W. Hammer and L. Platter, arXiv:1308.5975 [nucl-th].
[18] X. Kong and F. Ravndal, Phys. Lett. B **450**, 320 (1999); Nucl. Phys. A **665**, 137 (2000).
[19] R. D. Williams and S. E. Koonin, Phys. Rev. C **23**, 2773 (1981).
[20] D. Baye and E. Brainis, Phys. Rev. C **61**, 025801 (2000).
[21] D. Baye, Phys. Rev. C **62**, 065803 (2000).
[22] D. Baye, Nucl. Phys. A **758**, 114c (2005).
[23] X. Zhang, K. M. Nollett and D. R. Phillips, arXiv:1311.6822 [nucl-th].
[24] M. Abramowitz, I. A. Stegun (Eds.), *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Dover Publications, New York, 1972.
[25] M. L. Goldberger and K. M. Watson, *Collision Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1964)
[26] S. Koenig, D. Lee and H. -W. Hammer, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **40**, 045106 (2013).
[27] R. B. Wiringa, V. G. J. Stoks, and R. Schiavilla, Phys. Rev. C **51**, 38 (1995).
[28] B. S. Pudliner, V. R. Pandharipande, J. Carlson, and R. B. Wiringa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4396 (1995).
[29] G. Tabacaru, A. Azhari, J. Brinkley, V. Burjan, F. Carstoiu, C. Fu, C. A. Gagliardi and V. Kroha *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 025808 (2006).
[30] B. K. Jennings, S. Karataglidis and T. D. Shoppa, Phys. Rev. C **58**, 3711 (1998).
[31] B. W. Filippone, A. J. Elwyn, C. N. Davids and D. D. Koetke, Phys. Rev. C **28**, 2222 (1983).
[32] L. T. Baby *et al.* [ISOLDE Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 022501 (2003) [Erratum-ibid. **92**, 029901 (2004)].
[33] A. R. Junghans, E. C. Mohrmann, K. A. Snover, T. D. Steiger, E. G. Adelberger, J. M. Casandjian, H. E. Swanson and L. Buchmann *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 065803 (2003).
[34] A. R. Junghans, K. A. Snover, E. C. Mohrmann, E. G. Adelberger and L. Buchmann, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 012801 (2010).
[35] B. Davids and S. Typel, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 045802 (2003).
[36] F. Schümann, S. Typel, F. Hammache, F. Uhlig, K. Summerer, I. Bottcher, D. Cortina and A. Foerster *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 015806 (2006).
[37] T. Kikuchi, T. Motobayashi, N. Iwasa, Y. Ando, M. Kurokawa, S. Moriya, H. Murakami, T. Nishio, J. Ruon, S. Shirato, *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. A **3**, 213 (1998).
[38] P. Descouvemont, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 065802 (2004).
[39] X. Zhang, K. Nollett, and D. R. Phillips, in preparation.